

## REMARKS

Concurrent with this RCE is a request to abandon the appeal filed July 1, 2003.

In the Examiner's Answer to Applicants' Appeal, the following was noted on

5 pages 8-9:

Appellant remarks on page 4 of the brief, "Shiota does not show the specifics of a single order that specifies multiple recipients", at page 5, " Second, although Shiota's Fig. 1 shows a plurality of PCs, there is no showing that each PC can issue a single card order that specifies a plurality of recipients ", and " Shiota discusses an example showing that multiple prints may be ordered. However, the discussion below is silent on whether the customer can order for all recipients at once or one recipient at a time ".

The Examiner notes that the claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14, 16 and 21 neither recite that the card order received is "single" nor they recite that the customer can order for all recipients at once or one recipient at a time. Claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14, 16 and 21 merely recite "receiving a card order specifying a plurality of recipients ". Shiota clearly teaches this claimed limitation of placing and receiving an order for a plurality of recipients, which include himself and a friend of his (col. 11, lines 54-61). The examiner also notes that the Appellant has acknowledged this teaching of Shiota ( see page 5 of the brief "Shiota discusses an example showing that multiple prints may be ordered ").

Appellant remarks on page 5 of the brief, " Because Shiota's Fig.2 shows one recipient designation at a time , the only logical conclusion one can reach is that at one sitting, the user must individually enter a separate order for each recipient ".

The Examiner observes, as mentioned above, that claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14, 16 and 21 do not recite that an order is placed "at one sitting ". Claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14, 16 and 21 merely recite "receiving a card order specifying a plurality of recipients ". In Shiota, Fig.2 is a mere example of the flow of order information (see at least col.6, line 46). Shiota, as stated earlier, explicitly shows placing and receiving an order for a plurality of recipients, which include himself and a friend of his (col.11, lines 54-61).

Appellant remarks on page 7 of the brief, " Shiota does not show the user-uploaded aspect. This is another reason for traversing the section 102 Rejection ", " However, Shiota does not show that a user directly uploaded images. Hence Shiota does not have the user - uploaded aspect as claimed ", and on page 8 of the brief, " With regard to claims 5-6, Shiota shows that a print service uploads images scanned from film. However, there is no teaching in Shiota that a user directly uploads the images ".

The Examiner observes that the claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14, 16 and 21 do not recite the term " user directly uploaded images" , instead they recite "user- uploaded images".

5 Applicants hereby amend the claims to specifically recite the points noted as missing in the Examiner's Answer. In light of the Amendment, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Authorization to charge Deposit Account 501861 is granted.

10 If for any reason the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Bao Tran

Reg. 37,955